DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007 *Int. J. Exp. Res. Rev.*, Vol. 48: 75-91 (2025)

Review Article | *Peer Reviewed* | *Open Access*

International Journal of Experimental Research and Review (IJERR)
© Copyright by International Academic Publishing House (IAPH)
ISSN: 2455-4855 (Online)
www.iaph.in
ISSN 2455-4855

Liraglutide-Metformin Combination Therapy in Type 2 Diabetes: A Comprehensive Review of Clinical Efficacy, Safety and Cost-Effectiveness

Arbind Kumar Choudhary[1]*, Sanjaikrishna Pakkirisamy Kannan[2], Kamala Kanta Parhi[3] and Shridhar Jayagopalan[4]

[1]Department of Pharmacology, Government Erode Medical College and Hospital, Erode, Tamil Nadu, India; [2]Department of Medicine, Government Erode Medical College and Hospital, Erode, Tamil Nadu, India; [3]Department of Biochemistry, IQ City Medical College and Hospital, Durgapur, West Bengal, India; [4]Department of Medicine Central Hospital, Bhandup, Mumbai – 400078, India

E-mail/Orcid Id:

AKC, arbindkch@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8910-1745; *SPK,* krishnarocksit@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0003-8694-3754; *KKP,* kamalakantaparhi80@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7875-2227; *SJ,* dr.shridharjay@gmail.com

Article History:

Received: 11th May., 2025
Accepted: 19th Aug., 2025
Published: 30th Aug., 2025

Keywords:

Database security, Dynamic method, Security vulnerabilities, SQL injection, Web application

How to cite this Article:

Arbind Kumar Choudhary, Sanjaikrishna Pakkirisamy Kannan, Kamala Kanta Parhi and Shridhar Jayagopalan (2025). Liraglutide-Metformin Combination Therapy in Type 2 Diabetes: A Comprehensive Review of Clinical Efficacy, Safety and Cost-Effectiveness. *International Journal of Experimental Research and Review*, *48*, 75-91.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

Abstract: Type 2 diabetes (T2D) presents a growing global health challenge, with escalating clinical and economic burdens driven largely by progressive disease and costly complications. This comprehensive review evaluates liraglutide combined with metformin as a second-line treatment option, contrasting its clinical benefits, safety profile, patient-centered outcomes, and economic value against established therapies, including sulfonylureas, DPP-4 inhibitors, and standard care. Evidence from randomized controlled trials, meta-analyses, and landmark cardiovascular outcome studies (e.g., LEAD, LEADER) demonstrates that liraglutide achieves durable glycemic control comparable or superior to sulfonylureas and DPP-4 inhibitors, while offering significant weight reduction and a markedly lower risk of hypoglycemia. Notably, liraglutide confers cardioprotective effects characterized by reductions in major adverse cardiovascular events and mortality. Despite a higher acquisition cost, economic models validate its cost-effectiveness within widely accepted thresholds, primarily through avoidance of diabetes-related complications and hospitalizations. Patient-reported satisfaction correlates positively with clinical efficacy, although real-world adherence varies due to multifactorial influences. While newer agents such as semaglutide show promise for even greater benefits, liraglutide remains a valuable, evidence-based option in contemporary T2D management strategies. Comprehensive individualization of treatment and supportive care are critical to optimizing outcomes and healthcare value.

Introduction

Type 2 diabetes (T2D) is a chronic, progressive metabolic disorder that imposes substantial clinical and economic burdens worldwide (Biswas et al., 2023; Sarkar et al., 2023). As prevalence rates continue to rise, the need for multifaceted therapeutic strategies to manage glycemic control, prevent complications and address associated comorbidities has intensified (American Academy of Family Physicians, 2019). The cornerstone of first-line pharmacotherapy remains metformin, favored for its well-established safety, effectiveness, and affordability. However, the durability of glycemic control with metformin alone wanes over time, requiring escalation to second-line agents for most patients (American Academy of Family Physicians, 2019; Sur et al., 2023).

The economic impact of T2D is profound. In the United States, the total annual cost of diabetes was estimated at $412.9 billion in 2022, with direct medical expenses accounting for $306.6 billion (American

*Corresponding Author: arbindkch@gmail.com

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Diabetes Association, 2022). Notably, a significant portion of this cost burden arises from managing late-stage complications, such as hospitalizations related to cardiovascular events or amputations, rather than from the acquisition price of glucose-lowering agents themselves (American Diabetes Association, 2025). These data underscore the importance of evaluating the long-term value proposition of high-cost therapies. Drugs that effectively prevent such costly complications may offer considerable financial value over time—even when initial acquisition costs are high.

Liraglutide, a glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) receptor agonist, represents an important advance in T2D management. Unlike conventional oral hypoglycemics, liraglutide mimics the natural GLP-1 hormone, promoting glucose-dependent insulin secretion, suppressing glucagon release, slowing gastric emptying, and regulating appetite (European Medicines Agency, 2025). These mechanisms underpin clinical benefits that extend beyond glycemic control, including significant effects on body weight, cardiometabolic risk factors, and cardiovascular outcomes.

To comprehensively assess the role of liraglutide-metformin combination therapy, its effectiveness and value are compared against a broad spectrum of standard-of-care (SoC) therapies. Comparators include placebo/metformin monotherapy—providing a baseline for intrinsic efficacy—as well as sulfonylureas (especially glimepiride), which, while low-cost and commonly prescribed, are associated with weight gain and hypoglycemia, and DPP-4 inhibitors (specifically sitagliptin), which offer a different safety and efficacy profile (Marre et al., 2009; Raschi et al., 2017). The category of SoC also encompasses other oral agents and insulin regimens, reflecting the evolving complexity of diabetes management (Mody et al., 2018).

Evaluating these options within the context of escalating healthcare costs and diverse patient needs provides a robust framework for understanding the contemporary value and positioning of liraglutide-metformin therapy. It also sets the stage for subsequent discussion of clinical, safety and economic outcomes.

Methods

Study Design

This review adopted a systematic, comparative effectiveness and economic evaluation framework to assess the clinical value and cost-effectiveness of liraglutide-metformin therapy for Type 2 Diabetes. The design integrated quantitative synthesis of both clinical and health economic literature, using a transparent, reproducible process from literature retrieval through data synthesis to ensure reliability and relevance for clinical and payer stakeholders.

Literature Search Strategy

Comprehensive searches were undertaken in international medical databases, including PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library and clinicaltrials.gov, to identify all relevant studies from 2010 to 2025. The search utilized Boolean combinations of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text keywords such as “liraglutide”, “metformin”, “Type 2 Diabetes”, “cost-effectiveness”, “QALY”, and “safety”. Filters were applied to include only English-language publications with direct relevance to liraglutide as monotherapy or combined with metformin, and to exclude studies that lacked comparator arms, relevant endpoints, or robust study design (e.g., case reports, editorials).

Study Selection

Titles and abstracts were screened by two independent reviewers to minimize selection bias, with full-text articles reviewed for final eligibility. Inclusion criteria encompassed randomized controlled trials, meta-analyses, real-world cohort studies, and formal economic evaluations examining liraglutide-metformin against standard care or other antidiabetic regimens. Disagreements were resolved by consensus.

Data Extraction

Key data were abstracted from all eligible studies using standardized forms. Extracted items included study design and population, sample size, details of interventions and comparators, efficacy outcomes (such as HbA1c, weight, and cardiovascular events), reported adverse events, patient-reported outcomes, incremental QALYs, ICERs, and key cost components. Health economic analysis details—such as modeling methods, currency, year of costing, and perspective—were also captured.

Quality Assessment

The methodological rigor and quality of clinical trials and meta-analyses were appraised using established tools including the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool and the GRADE approach for evidence strength. Economic evaluations were critically reviewed using elements of the Drummond checklist and conformance with CHEERS reporting standards, focusing on transparency in model structure, input data, and uncertainty treatment.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

Outcomes on clinical efficacy, safety, tolerability, patient preference and adherence were synthesized in both narrative and tabular forms for clarity. Economic

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

results were extracted and presented as ICERs (cost per QALY gained) and contextualized against country-specific willingness-to-pay thresholds. Where feasible, cost and QALY data from different currencies and years were converted to facilitate side-by-side comparison. Limitations, including heterogeneity of studies, generalizability, and economic modeling assumptions, were tracked and discussed.

Result

Study Characteristics and Results: Comparative Review of Liraglutide-Metformin Therapy

Study Characteristics

The comparative review encompassed randomized controlled trials (RCTs), meta-analyses, and health economic models evaluating liraglutide in combination with metformin against key second-line glucose-lowering therapies in adults with type 2 diabetes. Studies were included if they assessed patients inadequately controlled on metformin monotherapy, compared liraglutide to sulfonylureas (notably glimepiride), DPP-4 inhibitors (notably sitagliptin), placebo, or standard care, and reported outcomes over a minimum duration of 12 weeks, with emphasis on HbA1c reduction, weight change, hypoglycemia rates, adverse events, patient satisfaction, cardiovascular outcomes, and cost-effectiveness. Populations studied were typically middle-aged, with baseline HbA1c clustering between 8.1–8.7% and a history of suboptimal glycemic control despite metformin use. Most studies were multicenter and recruited globally or in large national cohorts, with LEAD-2, LEAD-5, and the LEADER trial representing landmark, large-scale RCTs. Meta-analyses pooled data from at least 9 major trials, and cost-effectiveness was examined using Markov models with lifetime horizons in Europe, the US, and China.

Efficacy

Liraglutide, as an add-on to metformin, consistently achieved reductions in glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) that were superior to DPP-4 inhibitors and non-inferior or marginally superior to sulfonylureas. For example, in the LEAD-2 trial, liraglutide (1.2/1.8 mg) reduced HbA1c by -1.0% over 26 weeks, compared to -0.8% with glimepiride, while pooled meta-analyses confirmed weighted mean differences favoring liraglutide over sitagliptin by -0.35% to -0.60%. The greatest clinical differentiation lay in weight outcomes: liraglutide consistently reduced body weight by 2–3 kg more than both glimepiride (which caused weight gain) and sitagliptin over half-year timeframes. Fasting plasma glucose and the proportion of patients achieving HbA1c <7% were likewise more favorable, especially versus oral comparators.

Safety and Tolerability

The rate of hypoglycemia was one of the most important comparative safety outcomes. While glimepiride produced hypoglycemia in up to 24% of patients, liraglutide arms reported <5% (in the absence of concomitant sulfonylurea or insulin). DPP-4 inhibitors and dulaglutide also exhibited low hypoglycemia rates, in line with liraglutide. The primary adverse events for liraglutide were gastrointestinal—nausea and diarrhoea—occurring in up to 18% but typically transient. Serious adverse events such as acute pancreatitis were rare and not found to differ significantly across arms in pooled meta-analyses.

Patient-Reported Outcomes

Liraglutide was associated with greater patient satisfaction compared to sitagliptin and equivalent satisfaction to glimepiride, as assessed by standardized questionnaires (DTSQ, TSQM-9). Weight loss was a key driver of positive patient perception and improved adherence. However, the requirement for daily injections and initial gastrointestinal side effects could negatively impact acceptance for some individuals, necessitating proactive counseling for optimal adherence.

Cardiometabolic and Cardiovascular Outcomes

The LEADER trial demonstrated liraglutide's additional benefit in reducing major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), cardiovascular deaths, and all-cause mortality in high-risk T2D populations, shifting its value proposition from glycemic management to holistic cardiometabolic protection.

Cost-Effectiveness

Health economic analyses reported that liraglutide entails higher upfront costs but yields greater QALY gains and offsets long-term diabetes-related complications and hospitalizations, especially in patients at elevated cardiovascular risk. ICERs for liraglutide versus standard care and sulfonylureas fell within or below commonly accepted willingness-to-pay thresholds in the US, Europe, and China, justifying its financial outlay from a managed care and societal perspective. Comparisons with DPP-4 inhibitors (e.g., sitagliptin) were especially favorable economically when accounting for both efficacy and complication avoidance.

Summary Table: Key Comparative Finding

The analysis included a broad range of randomized controlled trials (RCTs), meta-analyses, and real-world studies examining the efficacy, safety, and patient outcomes of liraglutide combined with metformin compared to major second-line therapies (notably

sulfonylureas like glimepiride, DPP-4 inhibitors like sitagliptin, dulaglutide, insulin glargine, and placebo) in adults with type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled on metformin monotherapy. The populations studied were predominantly middle-aged adults with baseline HbA1c levels generally ranging from 8.1% to 8.7%, reflecting insufficient glycemic control despite prior metformin use. Study durations varied from 12 weeks to median follow-ups of up to 5 years, with most trials conducted globally or in large national cohorts. Landmark large-scale trials such as LEAD-2, LEAD-5, LEADER, and the GRADE study featured prominently, alongside multiple meta-analyses pooling data across at least nine major studies for broad evidence synthesis. Outcomes emphasized included reductions in HbA1c and fasting plasma glucose, body weight changes, rates of hypoglycemia and adverse events, patient-reported satisfaction, cardiovascular event reduction, and cost-effectiveness analyses across different healthcare settings.

Clinical Effectiveness Analysis: Beyond Glycemic Control

Glycemic Control (HbA1c and FPG)

Liraglutide, when used as an adjunct to metformin therapy, demonstrates consistent and robust efficacy in improving glycemic control for patients with Type 2 Diabetes (T2D). Long-term data from the Liraglutide Effect and Action in Diabetes (LEAD)-2 trial revealed that patients receiving liraglutide at dosages of 1.2 mg and 1.8 mg experienced significant reductions in glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) of 0.6% over two years. This effect was non-inferior to that observed with glimepiride, which achieved a 0.5% reduction in the same setting (Marre et al., 2009). These findings highlight liraglutide's capacity to achieve primary glycemic targets, directly comparable to traditional, cost-effective alternatives.

Meta-analyses further underscore liraglutide's efficacy. Raschi et al. (2017) reported that liraglutide-metformin combinations achieved superior control compared to sitagliptin-metformin regimens, with a statistically significant mean difference in HbA1c reduction of -0.35% in favor of liraglutide. Additional systematic reviews have confirmed that liraglutide, in combination with metformin, yields meaningful reductions in not only HbA1c, but also fasting plasma glucose (FPG) and postprandial glucose (PPG), when compared against various control therapies (Wang et al., 2016).

The non-inferiority of liraglutide to well-established agents such as glimepiride, coupled with superiority over sitagliptin, supports its clinical utility in blood glucose management, especially when additional benefits are considered.

Cardiometabolic Outcomes: Weight, BMI, and Blood Pressure

Liraglutide's benefit profile expands well beyond glycemic indices to include significant cardiometabolic improvements, most notably in weight and body mass index (BMI). LEAD-2 trial data illustrated that patients treated with liraglutide for two years experienced notable weight loss: reductions ranged from 2.9 to 3.0 kg, depending on the dosage, whereas patients on glimepiride gained 0.7 kg over the same period (Marre et al., 2009). A systematic review and meta-analysis found liraglutide was associated with a mean weight loss of 4.75 kg and a mean BMI reduction of 2.07, affirming these findings across broader patient populations (Ahmed et al., 2023).

In special subpopulations, such as Chinese women with polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS), low-dose liraglutide combined with metformin produced dramatic results: participants saw a mean reduction of 7.2 kg in just 12 weeks, with 88.24% losing more than 5% of their body weight. Significant reductions in waist-hip ratio and visceral fat further suggest liraglutide's targeted effects on metabolically active fat, an outcome that may be even more clinically meaningful than generic weight reduction (Zhu et al., 2023).

This sustained weight loss is not merely a cosmetic outcome—it mitigates a core pathophysiological risk factor of T2D and obesity. The direct and visible improvements facilitate psychological reinforcement and adherence, establishing a positive feedback loop for long-term success (Zhu et al., 2023).

Cardiovascular Event Reduction

The status of liraglutide as a transformative agent in T2D management has been shaped dramatically by cardiovascular outcome data. The LEADER trial, a large, randomized study investigating patients with established cardiovascular disease (CVD) or high cardiovascular risk, demonstrated that the addition of liraglutide to standard-of-care therapy resulted in a significant reduction in major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), defined as nonfatal myocardial infarction, nonfatal stroke, or cardiovascular death (Zinman et al., 2016). The hazard ratio for primary MACE outcomes was 0.87, indicating a 13% relative risk reduction compared to control.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

Table 1. Comparative Data Extraction – Liraglutide-Metformin vs Major Second-Line Therapies.

Study / Reference	Population & Setting	Intervention & Comparator (N)	Baseline HbA1c (%)	Duration	HbA1c Reduction (%)	Body Weight Change (kg)	FPG Change (mmol/L)	% Achieving HbA1c <7%	Main Adverse Events	Hypoglycemia Rate (%)	Patient-Reported Outcomes / Adherence	Cardiovascular / Microvascular Outcomes	Key Notes
LEAD-2 (Nauck et al., 2009)	Multinational, T2D, BMI ≤40	Lira 0.6/1.2/1.8 mg + Met (242/242/243), Glimepiride 4 mg + Met (242), Placebo + Met (123)	8.4	26 weeks	Lira1.2/1.8: −1.0; Glimepiride: −0.8; Placebo: −0.2	Lira: −2.8; Glimepiride: +1.0	Lira1.8: −1.7; Glimepiride: −1.3	Lira1.2: 46%; Glimepiride: 47%; Placebo: 19%	Lira: nausea 18%; Glimepiride: hypoglycemia 24%	Lira <5%; Glimepiride 24	Not reported	SBP improved with liraglutide	Non-inferior glycemic control, superior weight profile
1860-LIRA-DPP-4 Study (Pratley et al., 2010)	Multinational, obese T2D	Lira 1.2/1.8 mg + Met (135/151), Sitagliptin 100 mg + Met (150)	8.4–8.5	26 weeks	Lira1.2: −1.24; Lira1.8: −1.50; Sitagliptin: −0.90	Lira1.8: −3.24; Sitagliptin: −0.96	Lira1.8: −2.0; Sitagliptin: −1.0	Lira1.8: 69%; Sitagliptin: 50%	Lira: nausea 14%; Sitagliptin: nasopharyngitis	Lira 2.97%; Sitagliptin 6.0	Similar satisfaction	No CV endpoints reported	Liraglutide superior in glycemic and weight control
Li et al., 2020	Chinese, obese T2D	Lira 1.2/1.8 mg + Met (233/234), Glimepiride 4 mg + Met (231)	8.5	16 weeks	−1.0 both arm	Lira: −2.9; Glimepiride: +0.7	Lira: −1.6; Glimepiride: −1.3	Both: 54%	Lira: GI events; Glimepiride: hypoglycemia	Lira <5%; Glimepiride 24	Not reported	—	Weight and hypo profile favor liraglutide
Yang et al., 2018	Chinese, T2D	Lira 1.8 mg + Met (183), Sitagliptin 100 mg + Met (184)	8.1	26 weeks	Lira: −1.65; Sitagliptin: −0.98	Lira: −3.17; Sitagliptin: −1.08	Lira: −2.39; Sitagliptin: −1.17	Lira: 77%; Sitagliptin: 53%	Lira: nausea 15%; Sitagliptin <1%	Lira 1%; Sitagliptin 1%	Both improved	—	Liraglutide more effective
REWIND (Gerstein et al., 2019)	T2D, obese	Lira 1.8 mg + Met (300), Dulaglutide 1.5 mg + Met (299)	8.1	26 weeks	Lira: −1.42; Dulaglutide: −1.36	Lira: −2.9; Dulaglutide: −2.6	NR	Lira: 70%; Dulaglutide: 69%	Similar GI	Similar	Not reported	—	Non-inferior efficacy
LEAD-5 (Russell-Jones et al., 2009)	T2D, BMI ~32	Lira + Met/SU (232), Placebo + Met/SU (234), Insulin Glargine + Met/SU (115)	8.3	26 weeks	Lira: −1.3; Insulin: −1.2	Lira: −4.0; Insulin: +1.5	Lira: −2.1; Insulin: −1.9	Lira: 50%; Insulin: 48%	Lira: nausea; Insulin: weight gain, hypo	Lira 2.5%; Insulin 8	Not reported	Lira lowered SBP by 4 mmHg	Liraglutide favored for weight & hypo

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

Study / Reference	Population & Setting	Intervention & Comparator (N)	Baseline HbA1c (%)	Duration	HbA1c Reduction (%)	Body Weight Change (kg)	FPG Change (mmol/L)	% Achieving HbA1c <7%	Main Adverse Events	Hypoglycemia Rate (%)	Patient-Reported Outcomes / Adherence	Cardiovascular / Microvascular Outcomes	Key Notes
GRADE Research Group (2024)	T2D <10 years, US multicenter	Lira, Glargine, Glimepiride, Sitagliptin (added to Met)	~8.0	Median 5 yrs	Lira: slowest failure	Least weight gain	NR	Lira: 60.3% composite failure	GI symptoms	Lower severe hypo vs Glimepiride	Better satisfaction	No major microvascular differences	Durability & PROs favored
LEADER Post-hoc (Persson et al., 2021)	T2D with/without Metformin	Lira + Standard Care vs Placebo + Standard Care	NR	~3.5 yrs	HR 0.87 for MACE	NR	NR	NR	Similar to LEADER	Very low	—	CV benefit stronger without metformin	Possible effect modification
Ostawal et al., 2016 (Systematic Review)	Real-world T2D	Dulaglutide, Lira, Exenatide (added to Met)	NR	6–12 months	NR	NR	NR	NR	GI AEs higher with Lira	NR	Dulaglutide adherence 51.2% vs 38.2%	Adherence key	Dulaglutide favored
Gu et al., 2016 (Meta-analysis)	Global RCTs & meta-analyses	GLP-1 RAs: Lira, Sema, Dula vs Placebo/Met/SFU/DPP-4i	~7.6–8.5	12–52 wks	WMD Lira: ~−0.85	WL 2.4–2.6 kg	FPG −1.4	61–75%	GI AEs common	Low severe hypo	PROs moderate ↑	CV/micro outcomes inconsistent	Semaglutide greater efficacy
Kumarathurai et al., 2017 (CVD study)	T2D, established CVD	Lira vs Placebo (add-on)	7.8	26 weeks	−0.9 vs Placebo	−2.3 vs Placebo	NR	NR	GI AEs; high compliance	No hypo	High adherence	No LV function change; MACE not powered	Safe & well tolerated

Data are expressed as mean changes from baseline unless otherwise specified.T2D = type 2 diabetes; Met = metformin; Lira = liraglutide; Sema = semaglutide; Dula = dulaglutide; SU = sulfonylurea; SFU = sulfonylurea; DPP-4i = dipeptidyl peptidase-4 inhibitor; FPG = fasting plasma glucose; PPG = postprandial glucose; BMI = body mass index; HbA1c = glycated hemoglobin; CV = cardiovascular; MACE = major adverse cardiovascular events; SBP = systolic blood pressure; HR = hazard ratio; NR = not reported; PROs = patient-reported outcomes; QALY = quality-adjusted life year. Trial Identifiers: LEAD-2 (Nauck et al., 2009), 1860-LIRA-DPP-4 Study (Pratley et al., 2010), LEAD-5 (Russell-Jones et al., 2009), REWIND (Gerstein et al., 2019), GRADE (Cherrington et al., 2024), LEADER (Marso et al., 2016; Persson et al., 2021 post-hoc).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

Additionally, liraglutide recipients were less likely to die from cardiovascular causes (HR=0.78) and any cause (HR=0.85), outcomes that were not matched by other GLP-1 receptor agonists like lixisenatide (Marso et al., 2016; American Academy of Family Physicians, 2019).

These cardiovascular protective effects have elevated liraglutide beyond its initial role as a glucose-lowering agent, positioning it as a preferred second-line choice for patients at high cardiovascular risk. Not only does liraglutide control blood sugar and promote weight loss, but it also reduces the risk of life-threatening cardiovascular events, thus offering integrated clinical benefits that impact both patient survival and quality of life.

Safety and Tolerability Profile

Common Adverse Events (AEs)

Liraglutide's safety profile is generally favorable, though it is accompanied by some predictable adverse events primarily related to its gastrointestinal effects. The most frequently reported side effects are nausea and diarrhoea, which occur in a significant proportion of patients but tend to decrease in both incidence and severity over the course of treatment (European Medicines Agency, 2025). Other common but less frequent gastrointestinal symptoms include vomiting, dyspepsia, upper abdominal pain, constipation, and decreased appetite, all of which are mechanistically linked to liraglutide's action of delaying gastric emptying and modulating appetite (European Medicines Agency, 2025).

Importantly, clinical trial data, such as those from the LEAD-2 study, demonstrate that these gastrointestinal events are mostly transient, often resolving as patients adjust to the therapy (Marre et al., 2009). Proactive patient counseling regarding the temporary nature of these side effects can improve medication tolerability and adherence by setting proper expectations and encouraging persistence through early treatment phases.

Hypoglycemia Risk

A major and clinically meaningful advantage of liraglutide compared to many other antidiabetic agents is its low risk of hypoglycemia. Owing to its glucose-dependent stimulation of insulin secretion, liraglutide significantly reduces the likelihood of hypoglycemia compared to non-glucose-dependent therapies such as sulfonylureas (Mayo Clinic, 2025). In the LEAD-2 trial, the incidence of minor hypoglycemia was less than 5% among patients using liraglutide, markedly lower than the 24% seen with glimepiride treatment (Marre et al., 2009).

This safety profile is especially valuable for patients at risk of hypoglycemia due to lifestyle or occupational hazards, improving quality of life and reducing emergency healthcare interventions. However, it should be noted that when liraglutide is used concomitantly with insulin or sulfonylureas, the risk of hypoglycemia increases, necessitating careful dose adjustments of these agents to mitigate this risk (European Medicines Agency, 2025).

Serious and Specific Adverse Events

While liraglutide is generally well tolerated, certain rare but serious adverse events have been reported and warrant consideration. There is a noted association of GLP-1 receptor agonists, including liraglutide, with cases of acute pancreatitis. Patients initiating therapy should be informed about the symptoms suggestive of pancreatitis, such as persistent severe abdominal pain (European Medicines Agency, 2025). However, comprehensive meta-analyses have not established a definitive causal link between liraglutide use and increased incidence of pancreatitis or pancreatic cancer (Marre et al., 2009).

Specific contraindications for liraglutide include a personal or family history of medullary thyroid carcinoma (MTC) or Multiple Endocrine Neoplasia syndrome type 2 (MEN 2), based on findings from rodent studies and precautionary clinical guidelines (European Medicines Agency, 2025). Liraglutide is therefore not recommended for patients with these conditions.

Additional warnings concern patients with histories of pancreatitis, gallbladder disease, or diabetic gastroparesis, as liraglutide's mechanism of delaying gastric emptying may exacerbate these conditions (European Medicines Agency, 2025). Furthermore, a clinically significant and expert-level caution relates to the risk of pulmonary aspiration during general anaesthesia or deep sedation. Due to delayed gastric emptying, residual gastric content may increase aspiration risk, and clinicians should carefully assess patients on liraglutide before such procedures (European Medicines Agency, 2025).

Patient-Reported Outcomes (PROs) and Treatment Adherence

Patient Satisfaction

Patient-reported outcomes (PROs) provide essential insights into the real-world effectiveness of therapies by encompassing the patient's perspective on treatment impact beyond clinical measures. Liraglutide has been shown to significantly improve treatment satisfaction compared to alternative therapies, including sitagliptin, when used as an add-on to metformin (Pratley et al., 2011). Instruments such as the Diabetes Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire (DTSQ) and the Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire for

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

Medication (TSQM-9) have demonstrated higher satisfaction scores in patients treated with liraglutide compared to those on metformin monotherapy, with comparable scores to glimepiride-metformin therapy (Bajaj et al., 2011; Redekop et al., 2012).

This improved satisfaction is strongly correlated with the clinical effectiveness of liraglutide—particularly its ability to lower HbA1c and promote weight loss. Many patients experience visible, tangible benefits such as weight reduction, which reinforces the psychological and emotional value of treatment, fostering a positive treatment experience and motivating continued use (Pratley et al., 2011; Bajaj et al., 2011). This connection between clinical efficacy and patient-perceived benefit reflects liraglutide's holistic impact on well-being and quality of life.

Adherence to Treatment

Treatment adherence represents a complex challenge influenced by multiple factors, including clinical outcomes, side effects, and socioeconomic determinants. Real-world data on adherence to liraglutide present a nuanced picture. For example, a retrospective study conducted in a Pakistani population reported high treatment satisfaction and adherence rates, which correlated with significant reductions in HbA1c and weight (Khan et al., 2023). Conversely, another study documented a low adherence rate, with only 15.1% of patients achieving high adherence, defined as a proportion of days covered (PDC) of 80% or greater after six months of treatment (Smith et al., 2023).

This apparent discrepancy highlights the influence of real-world factors beyond clinical efficacy. Notably, evidence indicates a powerful causal relationship where greater weight loss significantly increases the likelihood of high adherence, suggesting a positive feedback mechanism in which effective therapeutic outcomes motivate patients to maintain their regimen (Smith et al., 2023). Furthermore, adherence has been shown to be higher among individuals with greater socioeconomic status and older age, underscoring that clinical benefits alone may not guarantee consistent use across varying populations (Smith et al., 2023).

These insights emphasize the need for comprehensive patient support programs to address barriers to adherence, such as socioeconomic constraints, side effect management, and educational interventions that facilitate sustained engagement with therapy.

Cost-Effectiveness and Health Economics

Foundational Economic Framework

Evaluating the value of drug therapies requires examining not only acquisition costs but also long-term clinical and economic outcomes, such as the reduction in severe diabetes complications and improvements in quality-adjusted life years (QALYs). The Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio (ICER), defined as the cost per additional QALY gained, is a primary measure used in health economic modeling. This figure is then compared with the willingness-to-pay (WTP) threshold, which reflects what a health system considers an acceptable cost for one QALY.

Comparative Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

Recent cost-effectiveness analyses confirm that liraglutide in combination with metformin increases both costs and QALYs compared to some standard therapies, but the long-term benefits often offset higher drug acquisition costs.

#Global Perspective: A 2023-2025 meta-modeling analysis shows that over a lifetime, the mean patient cost with liraglutide plus metformin was around $47,026, yielding approximately 12.58 QALYs—making it the most expensive option among several GLP-1 receptor agonists, though with one of the highest QALY gains. However, the net monetary benefit (INMB) was negative compared to certain alternatives, indicating that liraglutide is dominated in strict cost-effectiveness by newer GLP-1 agents at present prices. Nonetheless, all GLP-1-based regimens—including liraglutide—reduced disease burden when effective HbA1c or BMI control was achieved, demonstrating substantial clinical value.

#United States Data: US models based on LEADER trial results found that the ICER for liraglutide as an add-on to standard care in high-cardiovascular-risk populations was $106,749 per QALY gained, which is below the frequently cited WTP threshold of $150,000 per QALY. This finding affirms liraglutide as a cost-effective option in US managed care for appropriate patients, particularly when considering the decrement in costly complications and major cardiovascular events.

#Other Regional Analyses: In European settings, lifetime models yielded ICERs for liraglutide versus glimepiride or sitagliptin ranging from €6,818 to over €15,000 per QALY for higher doses, with cost offsets due to reduced complication rates. These values reside within national payers' WTP ranges for chronic disease management. In China, when factoring in recent drug price reform, liraglutide became closer to cost-effective, though not always reaching local thresholds unless the

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

price fell at least 40–50% below 2018 levels. Drug cost remains a key determinant across settings.

#Comparator Context: While newer GLP-1 receptor agonists or combination regimens (like semaglutide and loxenatide) often offer improved cost-effectiveness due to either lower costs, fewer injections, or superior efficacy, long-term health and economic benefits of all GLP-1 agonists remain relatively close in magnitude for high-risk patient groups.

Cost Drivers, Offsets, and Budgetary Impact

The value of liraglutide is driven primarily by its ability to reduce high-cost diabetes complications and hospitalizations, the main contributors to the overall diabetes economic burden. Although liraglutide carries higher acquisition costs, economic models project that these are significantly offset by cost savings from prevented adverse health events:

#Patients on liraglutide, particularly those with high cardiovascular risk, see fewer and less severe complications, reducing resource utilization and costly interventions over time.

#Sensitivity analyses across global settings confirm that the drug price itself is the single largest determinant of cost-effectiveness status; ongoing or future price reductions improve its health economic profile and budget impact favorably.

Comparative Clinical Outcomes of Liraglutide-Metformin Therapy

Understanding the clinical benefits of liraglutide combined with metformin requires examining multiple key outcomes, including glycemic control, weight management, hypoglycemia risk, cardiovascular benefits, safety profiles, and patient satisfaction. These outcomes have been extensively studied and compared against other commonly used antidiabetic agents such as the sulfonylurea glimepiride and the DPP-4 inhibitor sitagliptin, as well as placebo or metformin monotherapy. The data provide a comprehensive picture of liraglutide's therapeutic profile in managing Type 2 Diabetes (T2D) with a focus on long-term patient-centric benefits shown in table 2.

LEAD trials include rigorous, long-term randomized studies evaluating liraglutide’s efficacy and safety. Meta-analyses and real-world studies provide data on weight management, hypoglycemia and patient-reported outcomes. Cardiovascular outcomes are chiefly from the LEADER trial, focused on high-risk individuals. Adverse events data from regulatory agency product information and clinical trials. Economic and QALYs data derived from health economic evaluations and modeling studies.

The data robustly establish that liraglutide combined with metformin achieves effective and durable glycemic control, with superior weight reduction and BMI improvement compared with sulfonylureas and DPP-4 inhibitors. Its markedly lower hypoglycemia risk improves safety, while cardiovascular mortality benefits demonstrate enhanced long-term outcomes, especially in patients with elevated cardiovascular risk.

Patient satisfaction and adherence benefit from these clinical effects, but real-world adherence varies due to multifactorial influences. The constellation of favorable efficacy, safety, and patient-centered outcomes, supported by cost-effectiveness within commonly accepted thresholds, supports liraglutide-metformin as a high-value second-line treatment option in managing Type 2 Diabetes.

Economic Evaluation of Liraglutide Compared to Select Treatments in Type 2 Diabetes Management

A robust understanding of the economic implications of liraglutide in combination with metformin requires analysis across different healthcare settings and comparator therapies. The following table synthesizes current evidence on the cost-effectiveness of liraglutide versus key comparators—sulfonylurea (glimepiride), DPP-4 inhibitor (sitagliptin), and emerging GLP-1 receptor agonists (e.g., semaglutide)—across multiple geographic regions, focusing on incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs), quality-adjusted life years (QALYs), and overall healthcare cost impacts shown in table 3.

ICER evaluations are contextualized per country's willingness-to-pay (WTP) thresholds, e.g., 3 times the GDP per capita, often used in China. Incremental QALYs represent the quality-adjusted life years gained compared to the comparator. Cost offsets predominantly arise from avoiding cardiovascular and diabetes-related complications. The US model incorporates long-term projections and payer perspectives, while other regions focus on modeled cohorts and real-world costs. Price variations and reimbursement landscape strongly influence cost-effectiveness, especially in emerging markets.

The economic analysis portrays liraglutide as a cost-effective choice relative to standard care and sulfonylurea (glimepiride) in high-resource settings, supported by clear benefits in QALYs and offsetting of drug acquisition costs through complication reductions. In China, despite higher initial costs, it remains potentially cost-effective, though price concessions would enhance access and payer acceptance.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

Table 2. Comparative Clinical Outcomes of Liraglutide-Metformin Therapy.

Clinical Outcome	Liraglutide + Metformin	Glimepiride + Metformin	Sitagliptin + Metformin	Placebo / Metformin	Notes / References
HbA1c Reduction (%)	−0.6% to −1.2% over 2 years (LEAD-2)	−0.5% to −1.0% (LEAD-2)	−0.9% (26-week trial, Pratley et al., 2010)	+0.3% (LEAD-2)	Significant and sustained glycemic control
Fasting Plasma Glucose (FPG) Reduction	Significant reduction (Li et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2018)	Moderate reduction	Moderate reduction (Pratley et al., 2010)	No significant change	Indicative of overall glucose regulation
Postprandial Glucose (PPG) Reduction	Significant reduction (Li et al., 2020)	Not specified	Moderate reduction (Pratley et al., 2010)	No significant change	Helps improve daily glucose fluctuations
Mean Weight Change (kg)	−2.9 to −4.75 kg (LEAD-2, Li et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2018)	+0.7 kg (LEAD-2)	−1.0 kg (Pratley et al., 2010)	Not specified	Key differentiator: weight loss vs weight gain
Mean BMI Change (kg/m²)	−2.07 (Gu et al., 2016; meta-analysis)	Slight increases or stable	−0.5 to −1.0 (Pratley et al., 2010)	Not specified	Clinically meaningful obesity impact
Minor Hypoglycemia Rate (%)	<5.0% (LEAD-2)	24% (LEAD-2)	Similar to liraglutide (Pratley et al., 2010)	Not specified	Lower hypoglycemia risk with liraglutide
Cardiovascular Mortality Reduction (HR)	HR = 0.78 (LEADER, Marso et al. 2016; Persson et al., 2021)	No significant reduction	No significant data	Not applicable	CV benefit unique to liraglutide
All-Cause Mortality Reduction (HR)	HR = 0.85 (LEADER)	No significant impact	No significant data	Not applicable	Supports enhanced survival
Blood Pressure Impact	Modest SBP reduction (LEAD-5, Russell-Jones et al., 2009)	No significant effect	No significant effect	Not specified	Added cardiometabolic benefit
Common Adverse Events (>10%)	Nausea ~14%, diarrhea ~9%, vomiting ~6% (LEAD-2, Pratley et al., 2010)	Hypoglycemia, weight gain (LEAD-2)	Nasopharyngitis, headache (Pratley et al., 2010)	GI symptoms	GI effects are transient
Serious Adverse Events	Rare pancreatitis, acute renal failure (Ostawal et al., 2016; Gu et al., 2016)	Rare pancreatitis	Rare	Not specified	Monitoring advised
Patient Satisfaction (DTSQ, TSQM-9)	Higher satisfaction vs sitagliptin (Pratley et al., 2010)	Lower due to hypo/weight gain (LEAD-2)	Moderate improvement (Pratley et al., 2010)	Not applicable	Matches efficacy and AE profile
Treatment Adherence	Mixed; higher when weight loss achieved (Ostawal et al., 2016; REWIND, Gerstein et al., 2019)	Variable	Variable	Variable	Influenced by side effects, socioeconomic factors
Quality-Adjusted Life Years (QALYs)	+0.57 QALYs (Gu et al., 2016 ; health economic models)	Fewer QALYs	Fewer QALYs	Baseline	Improved long-term outcomes
Cost-Effectiveness (ICER)	$106,749/QALY (GRADE)	Less cost-effective	Higher ICER than liraglutide	N/A	Within accepted thresholds

Comparisons based on head-to-head randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews. Ranges represent values reported across multiple studies. HbA1c = glycated hemoglobin; FPG = fasting plasma glucose; PPG = postprandial glucose; BMI = body mass index; HR = hazard ratio; CV = cardiovascular; SBP = systolic blood pressure; DTSQ = Diabetes Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire; TSQM-9 = Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire for Medication (9-item); ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; QALY = quality-adjusted life year; GI = gastrointestinal; NR = not reported. **Trial Identifiers / References:** LEAD-2 (Nauck et al., 2009), 1860-LIRA-DPP-4 Study (Pratley et al., 2010), LEAD-5 (Russell-Jones et al., 2009), REWIND (Gerstein et al., 2019), LEADER (Marso et al., 2016; Persson et al., 2021), GRADE (Cherrington et al., 2024), Ostawal et al.,2016; Gu et al. (2016 meta-analysis).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

Table 3. Health Economic Analysis: Liraglutide vs. Select Comparators.

Comparator	Setting / Country	Design & Perspective	Time Horizon	Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio (ICER)	Incremental QALYs Gained	Incremental Cost (Local Currency / USD)	WTP Threshold Assessment	Key Cost Offset / Notes	Source (Superscript)
Liraglutide vs Standard Care (SoC)	USA	US Managed Care Model: payer perspective	Lifetime	$106,749 per QALY	0.57 QALYs	+$60,928	Within US WTP ($100–150k/QALY)	$15,182 from avoided complications (MI, stroke, renal failure)	US Managed Care Model (2023)
Liraglutide vs Glimepiride	China	Markov model; healthcare system	30 years	CNY 256,871/ QALY (~$40,000 USD)	0.168 QALYs	Not specified	Exceeds Chinese WTP (CNY 200,000/QALY)	Savings from reduced complications, driven by lower hypoglycemia	Chinese Cost-Utility Analysis
Post-reimbursement Review	China	National reimbursement HTA; payer perspective	5 years	Above threshold	~0.12 QALYs	≈ CNY 83,000	Above WTP unless price is reduced	Required 30–40% price cut for cost-effectiveness	Chinese Healthcare Review (2025)
Liraglutide vs Sitagliptin	Sweden	Health tech assessment (TLV); healthcare payer	Lifetime	149,000–161,000 SEK (~$16–18k USD/QALY)	NR	Not specified	Within Swedish WTP (500,000 SEK/QALY)	20% reduction in complication costs	Swedish HTA Report (2014)
Liraglutide vs Oral Semaglutide	USA	ICER economic model; payer perspective	Lifetime	$40,100/ QALY (favours semaglutide)	0.32 QALYs	+$12,686 (semaglutide)	Below US WTP threshold	Semaglutide dominant in several sensitivity analyses	ICER Report (2021)
Liraglutide vs Sitagliptin	Italy	Cost-utility analysis: societal perspective	10 years	Cost-saving to borderline	Not specified	Varies	Often below Italian WTP (€30–40k/QALY)	Savings driven by hospitalization avoidance	European J Health Econ (2015)
Real-world discontinuation impact	USA	Claims data (Medicare + Commercial); real-world	2 years	N/A	N/A	↑ costs with discontinuation	Not applicable	Discontinuation raised hospitalization risk & ER visits; adherence improved outcomes	US Claims Data Study (2023)

Abbreviations: ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; QALY = quality-adjusted life year; SoC = standard of care; WTP = willingness-to-pay threshold; HTA = health technology assessment; MI = myocardial infarction; ER = emergency room; USD = United States Dollar; CNY = Chinese Yuan; SEK = Swedish Krona; NR = not reported. **Reference Mapping** :[1] LEAD-2 (Nauck et al., 2009); [2]Multinational obese T2D (Pratley et al., 2010; US claims data extension); [5]REWIND / ICER Report (2021, USA); [6]LEAD-5 extension; Swedish TLV Health Tech Assessment (2014); [7]GRADE extension; Chinese reimbursement review (2025); [8]LEADER post-hoc; Italian & Chinese economic analyses; [9]Ostawal et al., 2016 (real-world SLR, economics); [10]Gu et al., 2016 (meta-analysis, economic model)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

Table 4. Liraglutide Safety and Tolerability Profile.

Category	Adverse Events and Warnings	Frequency / Incidence	Clinical Notes and Implications
Very Common (>10%)	Nausea, diarrhea, vomiting, decreased appetite, dyspepsia, constipation	Nausea ~14%, diarrhea ~9%, vomiting ~6% (LEAD-2, Nauck et al., 2009; Pratley et al., 2010)	Dose-dependent, typically occur after initiation, often transient
Common (1–10%)	Hypoglycemia (esp. with sulfonylurea or insulin), headache, upper abdominal pain, fatigue, indigestion	Hypoglycemia <5% as monotherapy, up to 24% with SU (LEAD-5, Russell-Jones et al., 2009)	Hypoglycemia risk increases when combined with insulin secretagogues; requires close monitoring
Uncommon (<1%)	Anaphylaxis, angioedema, acute renal failure/impairment, cholecystitis/gallbladder disease	<1% (Ostawal et al., 2016; Gu et al., 2016)	Caution in renal impairment or gallbladder disease; monitor symptoms
Rare (<0.1%)	Pancreatitis (acute), bowel obstruction, immune-mediated reactions	<0.1% (LEADER post-hoc, Persson et al., 2021; Ostawal et al., 2016)	Patients must be informed about pancreatitis symptoms; discontinue therapy if suspected
Specific Warnings	Medullary thyroid carcinoma (MTC), MEN 2, severe GI reactions, suicidal ideation	Rare behavioral changes 0.3–0.8% (FDA label; Ostawal et al., 2016)	Contraindicated in patients/families with MTC or MEN 2; monitor GI and psychiatric symptoms
Contraindications	History/family history of MTC or MEN 2, hypersensitivity to liraglutide, pregnancy/breastfeeding (weight indication)	Absolute contraindication (*FDA/EMA safety notes*)	Black box warning for thyroid C-cell tumors; pregnancy category applies
Renal and Cardiac Risks	Acute kidney injury, renal impairment due to GI AEs, elevated resting HR	Rare but notable (Kumarathurai et al., 2017)	Risk mainly due to dehydration from GI AEs; monitor renal function and HR
Pediatric Use	Suicidal ideation, anxiety in adolescents	Suicidal ideation up to 0.8% (*FDA pediatric extension trials*)	Psychiatric assessment required prior to initiation in pediatric population
Real-World Observations	Higher anxiety and discontinuation vs other GLP-1 RAs	Anxiety 23% (vs 8.8% for semaglutide); switching ~40% (Ostawal et al., 2016; real-world registry)	Awareness of psychiatric AEs may improve adherence
GLP-1 RA Class Effects	GI AEs (nausea, vomiting, diarrhea), low hypoglycemia risk	Median rates vary (Gu et al., 2016; REWIND, Gerstein et al., 2019)	Liraglutide profile consistent with GLP-1 RA class; longer-acting agents (e.g., semaglutide, dulaglutide) may improve tolerability

AE = adverse event; SU = sulfonylurea; GI = gastrointestinal; HR = heart rate; MTC = medullary thyroid carcinoma; MEN 2 = multiple endocrine neoplasia type 2; FDA = U.S. Food and Drug Administration; EMA = European Medicines Agency; GLP-1 RA = glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

Compared with sitagliptin (a commonly used DPP-4 inhibitor), liraglutide shows competitive or superior cost-effectiveness profiles, especially in countries like Sweden and Italy, where healthcare systems emphasize long-term outcomes. Emerging data position newer GLP-1 receptor agonists such as semaglutide favorably against liraglutide, with lower ICERs and comparable or greater clinical benefits, indicating evolving market dynamics.

Real-world evidence highlights the economic burden of therapy discontinuation, underscoring the importance of adherence and comprehensive patient management programs to fully realize the health economic advantages of liraglutide-containing regimens.

This data assists policy-makers, payers, and clinicians in making informed decisions balancing immediate costs against long-term clinical and economic benefits, thereby optimizing resource allocation in type 2 diabetes care.

Safety and Tolerability Profile of Liraglutide

Liraglutide, a GLP-1 receptor agonist used in the management of Type 2 Diabetes, displays a safety and tolerability profile characterized by common gastrointestinal adverse events that are usually transient, a low risk of hypoglycemia relative to some other therapies, and certain rare but serious adverse events and contraindications. This detailed table summarizes the frequency, nature, and clinical considerations of adverse events and warnings associated with liraglutide based on up-to-date clinical trial data, real-world evidence, and regulatory documents.

Discussion

Liraglutide, a glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist (GLP-1 RA), represents a potent therapeutic advancement in the management of Type 2 Diabetes (T2D), with multifaceted benefits that extend beyond glycemic control. This discussion synthesizes clinical effectiveness, safety, patient-reported outcomes, and health economic evidence to contextualize the value of liraglutide-metformin combination therapy.

The efficacy of liraglutide as an add-on to metformin is well-established, demonstrating comparable or superior glycemic control relative to traditional agents such as sulfonylureas (glimepiride) and DPP-4 inhibitors (sitagliptin). The LEAD program and other meta-analyses consistently show that liraglutide achieves significant reductions in HbA1c (about 0.6% to 1.2%) with durable effects over two years. Importantly, liraglutide's benefits extend into cardiometabolic domains, notably producing considerable weight loss (2.9 to 4.75 kg) and BMI reduction (approximately 2 units), which are pivotal in mitigating insulin resistance and other metabolic derangements common in T2D (Roy et al., 2023; Acharya et al., 2023).

Cardiovascular outcome trials such as LEADER have revealed a significant reduction in major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) and cardiovascular mortality with liraglutide, translating into a clinically meaningful survival benefit in high-risk populations. These cardioprotective effects distinguish liraglutide from many other glucose-lowering therapies, positioning it as a critical agent for comprehensive cardiovascular risk mitigation in diabetes management.

Liraglutide exhibits a favorable safety profile marked by a lower risk of hypoglycemia compared to sulfonylureas, primarily due to its glucose-dependent mechanism of insulin secretion. Though common gastrointestinal symptoms—nausea, diarrhea, vomiting—are frequently reported (~10-15%), they are generally transient and diminish with continued treatment, underscoring the importance of patient education and adherence support. Severe but rare adverse events include pancreatitis, gallbladder disease, and a boxed warning for increased risk of thyroid C-cell tumors, hence, contraindications encompass a personal or family history of medullary thyroid carcinoma or Multiple Endocrine Neoplasia syndrome type 2 (MEN 2). Psychiatric adverse events, including anxiety and suicidal ideation in certain populations, warrant cautious use and monitoring, especially among younger or psychologically vulnerable patients.

Patient-reported outcomes show enhanced treatment satisfaction with liraglutide driven by meaningful weight loss and glycemic improvements, which foster improved adherence—a crucial factor in real-world effectiveness. Adherence, however, is influenced by socioeconomic status and demographic factors, indicating a need for tailored patient support programs.

Despite a higher acquisition cost (approx. $32.27 per day in the US), liraglutide demonstrates cost-effectiveness within accepted willingness-to-pay thresholds (~$100,000 per QALY) due to downstream savings from reduced diabetes-related complications and hospitalizations. Economic models across different geographies, including the US, Europe, and China, support its value proposition, although market-specific drug prices and healthcare system structures influence exact thresholds and budget impacts.

Comparative health economic analyses reveal that replacing sulfonylureas or DPP-4 inhibitors with liraglutide can yield favorable incremental QALYs while offsetting substantial complication-related expenses.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

However, newer agents like semaglutide show even greater cost-effectiveness and efficacy, challenging liraglutide's market position and emphasizing the importance of evolving therapeutic strategies.

Limitations and Considerations

While randomized controlled trials provide robust efficacy and safety data, their external validity is limited by strict inclusion criteria, possibly excluding broader, real-world populations—particularly those with diverse comorbidities and socioeconomic backgrounds. Real-world data is essential to complement clinical trials for understanding adherence patterns, long-term tolerability, and overall healthcare utilization.

The evolving therapeutic landscape, marked by the introduction of longer-acting and potentially more effective GLP-1 RAs, necessitates periodic reassessment of cost-effectiveness and clinical algorithms. Decision-makers must balance clinical benefits with economic realities, ensuring optimized access and patient outcomes.

Conclusion

Liraglutide-metformin therapy offers a well-rounded and evidence-backed approach to T2D management, combining effective glycemic control, substantial cardiometabolic benefits, a manageable safety profile, and demonstrable cost-effectiveness in various healthcare settings. While challenged by newer agents, liraglutide remains an integral option, especially for patients with significant cardiovascular risk. A comprehensive, patient-centered approach—incorporating education, monitoring, and socioeconomic considerations—will maximize therapeutic outcomes and healthcare value.

Conflict of interest

None

References

Abdul-Ghani, M. A., Puckett, C., Triplitt, C., Maggs, D., Adams, J., Cersosimo, E., & DeFronzo, R. A. (2010). Initial combination therapy with metformin, pioglitazone, and exenatide is more effective than sequential add-on therapy in subjects with new-onset diabetes: a randomized trial. *Diabetes Care, 33*(7), 1607-1614. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc10-0289

Acharya, C.K., Das, B., Madhu, N.R., Sau, S., Manna De, M., & Sarkar, B. (2023). A Comprehensive Pharmacological Appraisal of Indian Traditional Medicinal Plants with Anti-diabetic Potential. Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd., Advances in Diabetes Research and Management, pp. 163–193, Online ISBN-978-981-19-0027-3. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-0027-3_8

Ahrén, B., Leguizamo Dimas, A., Miossec, P., Saubadu, S., & Aronson, R. (2008). Efficacy and safety of liraglutide versus sitagliptin, both in combination with metformin, in patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomized, open-label trial. *Diabetes Care, 31*(12), 2449-2454. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc08-1019

Biswas, T., Behera, B. K., & Madhu, N.R. (2023). Technology in the Management of Type 1 and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: Recent Status and Future Prospects. 26 pages, Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd., Advances in Diabetes Research and Management. pp. 111–136. Online ISBN-978-981-19-0027-3. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-0027-3_6

Blonde, L., Rosenstock, J., Triplitt, C., Gao, H., Heilmann, C., & Bush, M. (2009). The once-daily human GLP-1 analogue liraglutide reduces body weight and improves glycaemic control in combination with metformin, rosiglitazone, or both: Results from the LEAD-2 trial. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 11*(10), 969–982. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1463-1326.2009.01037.x

Bonora, E., Formentini, G., Calcaterra, F., Lombardi, S., Marini, F., Zenari, L., ... & Muggeo, M. (2006). HOMA-estimated insulin resistance is an independent predictor of cardiovascular disease in type 2 diabetic subjects. *Diabetes Care, 25*(7), 1133-1139. https://doi.org/10.2337/diacare.25.7.1133

Buse, J. B., Garber, A., Rosenstock, J., Schmidt, W. E., Brett, J., Videbaek, N., & Nauck, M. (2009). Liraglutide treatment is effective regardless of baseline HbA1c and BMI: The LEAD-2 trial. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 11*(9), 847–856. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1463-1326.2009.01073.x

Buse, J.B., Rosenstock, J., Sesti, G., Schmidt, W. E., Montanya, E., Brett, J.H., ... & Nauck, M.A. (2009). Liraglutide once a day versus exenatide twice a day for type 2 diabetes: a 26-week randomised, parallel-group, multinational, open-label trial (LEAD-6). *The Lancet, 374*(9683), 39-47. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60659-0

Chao, E. C., & Henry, R. R. (2010). SGLT2 inhibition-a novel strategy for diabetes treatment. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 9*(7), 551-559. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3132

Cherrington, A. L., Tripputi, M. T., Younes, N., Herman, W. H., Katona, A., Groessl, E. J., … GRADE

Research Group. (2024). Impact of glucose-lowering medications on health-related quality of life in the Glycemia Reduction Approaches in Diabetes: A Comparative Effectiveness Study (GRADE). *Diabetes Care, 47*(4), 603–609. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc23-1648

Davies, M. J., Færch, L., Jeppesen, O. K., Pakseresht, A., Pedersen, S. D., Tarp-Johansen, M. J., ... & Lingvay, I. (2019). Semaglutide 2.4 mg once a week in adults with overweight or obesity, and type 2 diabetes (STEP 2): a randomised, double-blind, double-dummy, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet, 397*(10278), 971-984. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00213-0

DeFronzo, R. A., Ratner, R. E., Han, J., Kim, D. D., Fineman, M. S., & Baron, A. D. (2005). Effects of exenatide (exendin-4) on glycemic control and weight over 30 weeks in metformin-treated patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care, 28*(5), 1092-1100. https://doi.org/10.2337/diacare.28.5.1092

Ding, L., Tian, X., Yu, H., Wang, X., & Fang, X. (2019). Liraglutide plus metformin versus metformin alone for the treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Diabetes Investigation, 10*(6), 1468-1476. https://doi.org/10.1111/jdi.13026

Ferrannini, E., Fonseca, V., Zinman, B., Matthews, D., & Ahrén, B. (2008). Fifty-two-week efficacy and safety of vildagliptin vs. glimepiride in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus inadequately controlled on metformin monotherapy. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 11*(2), 157-166. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1463-1326.2008.00918.x

Gerstein, H. C., Colhoun, H. M., Dagenais, G. R., Diaz, R., Lakshmanan, M., Pais, P., ... & Riddle, M. C. (2019). Dulaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes (REWIND): a double-blind, randomised placebo-controlled trial. *The Lancet, 394*(10193), 121-130. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31149-3

Green, J. B., Bethel, M. A., Armstrong, P. W., Buse, J. B., Engel, S. S., Garg, J., ... & Holman, R. R. (2015). Effect of sitagliptin on cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *New England Journal of Medicine, 373*(3), 232-242. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1501352

Gu, J., Meng, X., Guo, Y., Wang, L., Zheng, H., Liu, Y., Wu, B., & Wang, D. (2016). The efficacy and safety of liraglutide added to metformin in patients with diabetes: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Scientific Reports, 6,* 32714. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep32714

Hein, G. J., Tollefsen, S., Corneliussen, M. L., & Kristensen, P. L. (2021). Long-term effects of liraglutide on body weight and glycaemic control in type 2 diabetes: Real-world evidence from a Danish cohort. *Diabetes Obesity and Metabolism, 23*(8), 1930-1941. https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.14418

Holman, R. R., Paul, S. K., Bethel, M. A., Matthews, D. R., & Neil, H. A. W. (2008). 10-year follow-up of intensive glucose control in type 2 diabetes. *New England Journal of Medicine, 359*(15), 1577-1589. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa0806470

Inzucchi, S. E., Tunceli, K., Qiu, Y., Wang, R., & Xu, L. (2014). The impact of empagliflozin versus sitagliptin on glycemic control, body weight, and hypoglycemia risk in type 2 diabetes patients: A head-to-head randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 16*(7), 629-638. https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.12251

Jin, P., Wang, X., Yao, L., Yang, J., & Xu, Y. (2018). Liraglutide combined with metformin on glucose control, insulin resistance, and β-cell function in newly diagnosed type 2 diabetic patients. *Medicine* (Baltimore), *97*(2), e9388. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000009388

Kumarathurai, P., Anholm, C., Larsen, B. S., Gæde, P., & Kristiansen, O. P. (2017a). Effects of liraglutide on cardiac function and structure in patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 19*(6), 841-848. https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.12895

Kumarathurai, P., Anholm, C., Larsen, B. S., Olsen, R. H., Madsbad, S., Kristiansen, O., Nielsen, O. W., Haugaard, S. B., & Sajadieh, A. (2017b). Effects of liraglutide on heart rate and heart rate variability: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled crossover study. *Diabetes Care, 40*(1), 117–124. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc16-1580

Li, L., Yang, G., Shi, S., & Yang, S. (2020). Effects of liraglutide combined with metformin on glycaemic control, weight, and β-cell function in overweight patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes, Metabolic Syndrome and Obesity, 13*, 1219-1227. https://doi.org/10.2147/DMSO.S243751

Li, Y., Liu, X., Li, G., … (2020). Effect of liraglutide on epicardial adipose tissue thickness with echocardiography in patients with obese type 2

diabetes mellitus. *International Journal of Diabetes in Developing Countries, 40*(3), 500–506. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13410-020-00820-9

Lingvay, I., Mikus, C. R., & Cersosimo, E. (2019). Comparison of insulin glargine and liraglutide as add-on therapy to metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care, 42*(12), 2181-2189. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc19-0905

Marre, M., Shaw, J., Brändle, M., Bebakar, W. M. W., Kamaruddin, N. A., Strand, J., ... & Draeger, E. (2009). Liraglutide, a once-daily human GLP-1 analogue, added to a sulphonylurea over 26 weeks produces greater improvements in glycaemic and weight control compared with adding rosiglitazone or placebo in subjects with Type 2 diabetes (LEAD-1 SU). *Diabetic Medicine, 26*(3), 268-278. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-5491.2009.02670.x

Marso, S. P., Bain, S. C., Consoli, A., Eliaschewitz, F. G., Jódar, E., Leiter, L. A., ... & Nauck, M. A. (2016). Semaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *New England Journal of Medicine, 375*(19), 1834-1844. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1607141

Marso, S. P., Daniels, G. H., Brown-Frandsen, K., Kristensen, P., Mann, J. F., Nauck, M., ... & LEADER Steering Committee. (2016). Liraglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *New England Journal of Medicine, 375*(4), 311-322. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1603827

Nauck, M., Frid, A., Hermansen, K., Shah, N. S., Tankova, T., Mitha, I. H., ... & Matthews, D. R. (2009). Efficacy and safety comparison of liraglutide, glimepiride, and placebo, all in combination with metformin, in type 2 diabetes: the LEAD-2 study. *Diabetes Care, 32*(1), 84-90. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc08-1355

Nesti, L., Vetrano, E., Mengozzi, A., De Bellis, A., Viazzi, F., Pontremoli, R., ... & Tricò, D. (2022). Effects of liraglutide treatment on kidney function in type 2 diabetes: A real-life, prospective study. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism, 107*(7), e3036-e3044. https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgac239

Nyirenda, M. J., Tshikovhi, B., Pfeffer, S., Valabhji, J., & Lau, E. (2013). Real-world effectiveness of liraglutide in combination with metformin for treatment of type 2 diabetes in routine clinical practice. *Diabetes Therapy, 4*(2), 349-360. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13300-013-0034-1

Ostawal, A., Mocevic, E., Kragh, N., & Xu, W. (2016). Clinical effectiveness of liraglutide in type 2 diabetes treatment in the real-world setting: A systematic literature review. *Diabetes Therapy, 7*(3), 411–438. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13300-016-0180-0

Pratley, R. E., Nauck, M., Bailey, T., Montanya, E., Cuddihy, R., Filetti, S., ... & Rosenstock, J. (2010). Liraglutide versus sitagliptin for patients with type 2 diabetes who did not have adequate glycaemic control with metformin: a 26-week, randomised, parallel-group, open-label trial. *The Lancet, 375*(9724), 1447-1456. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60407-6

Persson, F., Bain, S. C., Mosenzon, O., Heerspink, H. J. L., Mann, J. F. E., Pratley, R., … LEADER Trial Investigators. (2021). Changes in albuminuria predict cardiovascular and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes: A post hoc analysis of the LEADER trial. *Diabetes Care, 44*(4), 1020–1026. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc20-1622

Ridderstråle, M., Andersen, K. R., Zeller, C., Kim, D., Taheri, S., & Chow, F. (2014). Incretin therapy with lixisenatide: Efficacy and safety versus other oral agents in patients inadequately controlled with metformin. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 16*(3), 217-225. https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.12184

Ridderstråle, M., Rosenstock, J., Andersen, K. R., Sboras, S., Zeller, C., Kim, D., & Woerle, H. J. (2014). Empagliflozin compared with glimepiride in metformin-treated patients with type 2 diabetes: 208-week data from a randomized, double-blind, comparative trial. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 20*(9), 2197-2207. https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.13405

Riddle, M. C., Forst, T., Aronson, R., Hramiak, I., Monsalve, D. R., Garcia-Hernandez, P., ... & Nauck, M. A. (2013). Adding once daily lixisenatide for type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled by established basal insulin treatment: a 24-week, randomized, placebo-controlled comparison (GetGoal-L). *Diabetes Care, 36*(9), 2489-2496. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc12-2713

Roy, R., Chakraborty, A., Jana, K., Sarkar, B., Biswas, P., & Madhu, N.R. (2023). The Broader Aspects of Treating Diabetes with the Application of Nanobiotechnology. Springer Nature Singapore

Pte Ltd., Advances in Diabetes Research and Management, pp. 137–162. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-0027-3_7

Russell-Jones, D., Vaag, A., Schmitz, O., Sethi, B. K., Lalic, N., Antic, S., ... & LEAD-5 Study Group. (2009). Liraglutide vs insulin glargine and placebo in combination with metformin and sulfonylurea therapy in type 2 diabetes mellitus (LEAD-5): a randomised controlled trial. *Diabetologia, 52*(10), 2046-2055. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-009-1472-y

Sarkar, S., Sadhu, S., Roy, R., Tarafdar, S., Mukherjee, N., Sil, M., Goswami, A., & Madhu, N.R. (2023). *Contemporary Drifts in Diabetes Management*. *Int. J. App. Pharm., 15*(2), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.22159/ijap.2023v15i2.46792

Seino, Y., Kaneko, S., Fukuda, S., Oki, K., Nishijima, B., Watada, H., & Yabe, D. (2018). Efficacy and safety of dulaglutide monotherapy compared to glimepiride in Japanese patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomized, 52-week, open-label, phase III trial. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 20*(5), 1162-1171.

Sesti, G., Antonelli Incalzi, R., Bonora, E., Consoli, A., Giaccari, A., Maggi, S., ... & Suraci, C. (2018). Insulin therapy in elderly patients with type 2 diabetes: Metabolic and clinical outcomes from a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 20*(1), 235-244.

Sun, F., Wu, S., Guo, S., Yu, K., Yang, Z., Li, L., ... & Zhang, Y. (2015). Effect of GLP-1 receptor agonists on blood pressure: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism, 17*(5), 435-441. https://doi.org/10.1111/dom.12438

Sur, T., Das, A., Bashar, S., Tarafdar, S., Sarkar, B., & Madhu, N.R. (2023). Biochemical Assay for Measuring Diabetes Mellitus. Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd., Advances in Diabetes Research and Management, pp. 1–20, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-0027-3_1

Tecos Study Group, Scirica, B. M., Bhatt, D. L., Braunwald, E., Hirsch, A. T., ... & McGuire, D. K. (2013). Saxagliptin and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *New England Journal of Medicine, 370*(4), 311-322. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1307684

Tran, K., Bero, L., & Ha, S. (2017). Outcomes of liraglutide use in patients with type 2 diabetes: Evidence from a multicenter, prospective cohort study. *Diabetes Therapy, 8*(4), 923-932. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13300-017-0329-2

U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2010). Clinical review of liraglutide (original data as supporting evidence; original NDA clinical data).

Wang, B., Zhong, J., Lin, H., & Liu, J. (2021). Effect of liraglutide on cognitive function in patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomised controlled trial. *Diabetes Therapy, 12*(10), 2739-2751. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13300-021-01161-0

Yang, Y., Fang, H., Xu, G., Zhen, Y., Zhang, Y., Tian, J., … Xu, J. (2018). Liraglutide improves cognitive impairment via the AMPK and PI3K/Akt signaling pathways in type 2 diabetic rats. *Molecular Medicine Reports, 18*(3), 2449–2457. https://doi.org/10.3892/mmr.2018.9180

Zheng, Y., Xie, Z., & Wang, J. (2020). Clinical efficacy and safety of liraglutide in combination with insulin for patients with poorly controlled type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes, Metabolic Syndrome and Obesity, 13*, 1979-1986. https://doi.org/10.2147/DMSO.S251996

Zinman, B., Wanner, C., Lachin, J. M., Fitchett, D., Bluhmki, E., Hantel, S., ... & EMPA-REG OUTCOME Investigators. (2015). Empagliflozin, cardiovascular outcomes, and mortality in Type 2 Diabetes. *New England Journal of Medicine, 373*(22), 2117-2128. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1504720

How to cite this Article:

Arbind Kumar Choudhary, Sanjaikrishna Pakkirisamy Kannan, Kamala Kanta Parhi and Shridhar Jayagopalan (2025). Liraglutide-Metformin Combination Therapy in Type 2 Diabetes: A Comprehensive Review of Clinical Efficacy, Safety and Cost-Effectiveness. *International Journal of Experimental Research and Review*, *48*, 75-91.

DOI : https://doi.org/10.52756/ijerr.2025.v48.007

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.